

REMARKS

Applicants have now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action of September 17, 2007.

Re-examination and reconsideration of the Application is requested.

The Office Action

Claims 1-53, 64 and 65 were presented for examination.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication of allowability as to claims 15, 42, 43, 45, 47, 50 and 51.

Claims 1-14, 16-41, 44, 46, 48, 49, 52, 53, 64 and 65 are noted as being rejected.

Claims 54-63 have been canceled.

New claims 66-68 are added.

Telephone Interview of March 5, 2008

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the telephone interview with the Examiner held on March 5, 2008. The interview included the Examiner, Applicants' representative, and Jim Stiles of Assignee's company.

During the telephone conversation, Applicants discussed the statement made in "Response to Arguments" section of the previous Office Action, which indicated the Boerner reference did not specifically disclose a "DC electroluminescent display."

During the telephone conference, Applicants explained that although Boerner may not have used those exact words, the description of the device within that reference did, in fact, describe a DC electroluminescent display.

It was also noted the description in the present application describes an AC electroluminescent display device. Again, although this term was not specifically used in the description of the present application, the structural description of the device is that of an AC electroluminescent display.

Applicants directed the Examiner's attention to language in the present application which supported this position, including the identification of the materials incorporated by reference which themselves are AC electroluminescent displays.

Also pointed out was the use of a thick film dielectric layer such as discussed, for example, on page 16, the paragraph beginning in line 13, which discusses use of such

a thick film dielectric layer 16, and along with Figure 1 defines it as being located between two electrodes. For example, a row electrode 14 and a viewing side electrode 32.

It was finally noted by Applicants such a configuration is not possible for a DC electroluminescent display.

Independent Claims 1, 31 And 64, As Well As Their Dependent Claims Are Distinguished

As Applicants understood the Examiner appreciated the distinctions raised during the telephone interview, it was understood by Applicants an amendment should be filed providing language corresponding to what was discussed, including language related to the thick film dielectric being located between the first and second electrodes. This language is added to further emphasize that the dielectric layers described in the Boerner patent are outside of the two electrodes of the device described in that patent. Particularly, the dielectric layers in Boerner's structure are not between the electrodes, but rather are on top of the structure in order to modulate the optical properties of the device, and in fact are not part of the structure of the device itself.

Therefore, independent claims 1, 31 and 64 have been amended in this manner.

It is submitted for at least these reasons, claims 1, 31 and 64 are distinguished.

As the dependent claims depend from and further distinguish these claims, it is submitted they are also distinguished. In addition, the Examiner has previously found patentable subject matter to exist in dependent claims 15, 42, 43, 45, 47, 50 and 51.

Applicants have made further amendments to various dependent claims to have them more particularly conform to the independent claims and the most recent amendments.

New claims 66-68 provide further distinguishing language.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons detailed above, it is submitted all remaining claims (Claims 1-53 and 64-68) are now in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is Remaining Claims, as delineated below:

(1) FOR	(2) CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT LESS HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	(3) NUMBER EXTRA
TOTAL CLAIMS	58	- 63 = 0
INDEPENDENT CLAIMS	3	- 3 = 0

- This is an authorization under 37 CFR 1.136(a)(3) to treat any concurrent or future reply, requiring a petition for extension of time, as incorporating a petition for the appropriate extension of time. The appropriate fee for the required Extension of Time is being charged to a Credit Card via the EFS Web.
- The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any filing or prosecution fees which may be required, under 37 CFR 1.16, 1.17, and 1.21 (but not 1.18), or to credit any overpayment, to **Deposit Account 06-0308**.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call Mark S. Svat, at Telephone Number (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY SHARPE LLP

3-11-08

Date

Mark S. Svat, Reg. No. 34,261
1100 Superior Avenue, Seventh Floor
Cleveland, OH 44114-2579
216-861-5582